

The Importance of the Citizen Advocacy Scheme in Facilitating Valued Roles for, & the Valuation of, Vulnerable People

Mitchel Peters

EDITOR'S NOTE: *This paper was presented at the Sixth International SRV Conference held in 2015 in Providence, RI (US).*

Introduction

ANYONE WHO IS INCLINED to think that humans are only driven by self-interest probably has not heard of Citizen Advocacy (Wolfensberger & Zauha, 1973; O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979). Nonetheless, even those who have heard of the Citizen Advocacy scheme, and who understand that its lifeblood is altruism, may not be aware of the nature and extent of the nexus between Citizen Advocacy (CA) and Social Role Valorization (SRV) (Wolfensberger, 1998).

The core theme of this article is that the Citizen Advocacy scheme is intrinsically structured so as to confer valued social roles, as well as valuation, to the recipients of its advocacy: in the nomenclature of CA, called the protégé. To that end, the paper will firstly explore the importance of interpersonal identification in CA relationships, i.e., "matches" in which the protégé is paired with an advocate, and especially the need for the advocate to identify with the protégé. The ways in which the Citizen Advocacy office promotes advocate identification with the protégé, and the implications of interpersonal identification—valued roles, valuation, and the good things of life, for the protégé—will then be examined. Finally, with reference to SRV's so-called role goals, a CA relation-

ship will be discussed, to demonstrate how some role goals have been realised for the protégé party.

Overview of Citizen Advocacy

THERE ARE A NUMBER of definitions of Citizen Advocacy. The following is not a strict definition, but a functional description of the work of CA:

Citizen Advocacy is a personal advocacy scheme that promotes and protects the interests of people whose wellbeing is at risk, by establishing and supporting one-to-one (or near one-to-one) unpaid, independent relationship commitments between such persons and suitable other members of the community. The Citizen Advocacy office matches the person in need of advocacy (protégé) and a person with relevant competencies (advocate), and provides support to the advocate who represents the interests of the protégé, as if those interests were the advocate's own. The roles assumed by advocates vary with each relationship, and include those of spokesperson, protector, mentor, assistant, and friend.

Those familiar with the history of Citizen Advocacy will be aware that the CA scheme was conceptualized by Wolf Wolfensberger in the latter half of the 1960s. Accordingly, it is to be expected

that embedded in the Citizen Advocacy scheme are concepts of the North American formulation of Normalization and Social Role Valorization (Peters, 2012). For example, in the manual used to evaluate CA programs, *CAPE: Standards for Citizen Advocacy Program Evaluation* (O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979), reference is made to the Normalization text (Wolfensberger, 1972) and the Program Analysis of Service Systems (PASS) evaluation tool (Wolfensberger & Glenn, 1975). References to Normalization theory in the CAPE manual are a reminder that the development of CA and the publication of CAPE pre-date the re-conceptualization of Normalization as Social Role Valorization. Thus, since its inception, and throughout its history, CA has been informed by Normalization initially, and by SRV subsequently.

A very clear example of the confluence of SRV and CA, at least in the image domain, is the fifth and last principle of Citizen Advocacy (O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979; Peters, 2007). The principle is called Positive Interpretations of Handicapped People. (Parenthetically, it warrants mention that Citizen Advocacy programs have tended to recruit advocates for people with handicaps, primarily of an intellectual nature.) According to this principle, the CA office should strive to avoid communicating negative images of people for whom advocates are recruited—that is, the protégé party—and other people with handicaps. At the same time, the principle states that the CA office should also promote positive, yet honest, images of protégés and other people with handicaps.

Although SRV concepts permeate the CA scheme, in keeping with the theme of this article, it is necessary to narrow the focus to the core work of the Citizen Advocacy office, commonly referred to as its key activities (O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979). The key activities pertain to the CA office's role in arranging and supporting the advocacy relationships or matches. Briefly: the office recruits the protégé and advocate; orients the advocate; matches the two parties; and sup-

ports the relationship in a number of ways without undermining its independent nature. Table 1 delineates the seven key activities of the Citizen Advocacy office.

Table 1
THE KEY ACTIVITIES OF THE
CITIZEN ADVOCACY OFFICE

1. Protégé recruitment 2. Advocate recruitment 3. Advocate orientation 4. Advocate-protégé matching	Arranging a match
5. Follow-up, follow-along, and support 6. Ongoing training 7. Advocate associate emphasis	Supporting a match

If there is careful matching and support by the Citizen Advocacy office, the likely outcomes for the protégé will include the conferral of valuation and valued roles. Central to the attainment of such outcomes is the CA office's promotion of advocate identification with the protégé.

The Citizen Advocacy Office's Promotion of Interpersonal Identification as a Facilitator of Valuation and Valued Roles

IN ITS IMPLEMENTATION of the key activities, the Citizen Advocacy office strives to arrange what is referred to as a "suitable match" (Wolfensberger & Peters, 2002/2003). The term "suitable match" is used specifically to refer to advocate-protégé matches that meet certain criteria. These criteria were formulated and refined to determine whether any given match is suitable. Two of the six criteria are of particular relevance here (Wolfensberger & Peters, 2002/2003):

The advocate is willing to take active steps, particularly vis-à-vis third parties, to address the protégé's needs and issues.

At least some important protégé needs and issues are addressed by the advocate.

With the above two criteria in mind, it can be cogently argued that a key ingredient propelling relevant advocate action is interpersonal identification. Interpersonal identification, one of the ten themes of SRV, is defined as follows (Wolfensberger, 1998):

Interpersonal identification means that one person sees another as being like him or herself, as having things in common; perhaps the person even sees him or herself in the other. The more people identify with each other, the more they are likely to want good things to happen to each other, and the more they are likely to do or provide good things to each other.

Given the nature of its mission, the Citizen Advocacy scheme strongly promotes the advocate and protégé identifying with each other. However, in the ensuing section, it is the promotion of the advocate's identification with the protégé that is emphasized. Specifically, closer examination of the aforementioned key activities of the CA office reveals that, all along the path of arranging and supporting a match, there are many in-built opportunities for the office to foster advocate identification with the protégé.

Protégé recruitment; advocate recruitment; and matching

AS A MATTER OF COURSE, the Citizen Advocacy office should recruit an advocate who is likely to identify with the protégé. If, for example, the protégé has an intellectual impairment, the CA office should discerningly seek out an advocate who displays empathy for people with such impair-

ments. Additionally, the office may take into consideration other protégé characteristics that will encourage advocate identification. For instance, the age of the protégé may be a relevant factor, if the advocate is someone who particularly identifies with people in a certain age group (O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979).

The introduction of the protégé to the advocate represents the culmination of the matching process. The CA office should structure the introduction so as to maximise the possibility that it will be a positive experience for both the advocate and protégé, which will then predispose the two parties to identify with each other. Keeping in mind the power and the persistence of first impressions, as much as possible, CA office staff can try to influence such factors as the personal appearance of the protégé, and the setting in which the two parties meet. For example, it is quite common for CA office staff to arrange an introduction in a valued community setting like a café. That way, from the outset, the protégé is likely to be seen in a positive light by the advocate.

Advocate orientation

SOME ADVOCATES, especially those who have been recruited judiciously, will easily and deeply identify with their protégé. However, other advocates may need a little help. The purpose of orientation is to prepare an advocate to assume the advocacy role. Accordingly, orientation of the advocate by the Citizen Advocacy office can provide the opportunity to create or consolidate empathy for the protégé.

Advocate orientation should comprise, among other elements, discussion of "the social situation of handicapped people" (O'Brien & Wolfensberger, 1979). Conceivably, then, content of the orientation would include the SRV insight of the common wounds of devalued people (e.g., Wolfensberger, 1998). However, the CA office's discussion of the wounding life experiences can be desirably adapted to capture and crystallise the particular circumstances of the protégé. In oth-

er words, the aim of the CA office staff is not to mechanically impart to the advocate an abstract understanding of all of the wounds that devalued people experience, but to instil a contextual understanding of those wounds that the protégé has endured and is still experiencing. Specifically, it would be important for the CA office staff to point out to the advocate the causal connections between the wounds. For instance, office staff can explain that the wound of rejection inflicted on the protégé led to the wound of lack of freely-given relationships; which rendered the protégé vulnerable; and that, in turn, led to the wound of brutalisation; and so on. Thus, relevant strands of wounding realities can be woven through the narrative in a way that fosters empathy for the protégé, and at the same time, sets the scene for the advocate's response.

Advocate orientation can also serve as a ready-made occasion to emphasize similarities between the advocate and the protégé, as well as between the latter party and other members of the community. Similarly for the purpose of helping the advocate identify more closely with the protégé, Citizen Advocacy office staff can also draw attention to valued roles held by the protégé, if there are some such roles. In doing so, the CA office may need to frame and interpret the protégé's activities in recognisable and relatable role terms: in effect, to generate role messages (Wolfensberger, 1998).

Follow-along and support

SUBSEQUENT TO THE MATCHING, during the provision of follow-along and support, the CA office's contact with the advocate can provide the opportunity to sensitively interpret developments in the protégé's life, in ways that encourage the advocate to walk a mile or more in the protégé's shoes.

Ongoing training

ONE FORM OF SUPPORT to the advocate is the Citizen Advocacy office's facilitation of ongoing training. The goal of ongoing training is to offer

information and affirmation to potentiate advocates and their advocacy. The CA office can thus opportunistically arrange for some of those training sessions to focus on interpersonal identification and related themes.

The power of interpersonal identification is eloquently recounted by A.J. Hildebrand—who served as a Citizen Advocacy co-ordinator in Beaver, Pennsylvania, for many years—in the following anecdote (Hildebrand, 1991):

When I first started to learn about how to “do” Citizen Advocacy, I went to Georgia to learn. A citizen advocate from Gainesville, Georgia, helped me to understand Citizen Advocacy in a way that was very powerful. The advocate was a woman who helped her protégé find a job, an apartment, join a church, learn how to use a bus, deal with everyday problems, and on and on. I asked her why she did what she did. Her response was simple, and beautiful. She said, “I look at him like he was me, and then I help him.”

The above vignette demonstrates how interpersonal identification can be an important facilitator of valuation of the protégé (“I look at him like he was me ...”), as well as serve as the motivator and motor (“... and then I help him”) of advocate-enabled valued roles for the protégé (worker, tenant, church member, and commuter).

At this juncture, however, attention must be directed at some caveats about valuation vis-à-vis valued roles, from the perspective of SRV. In particular, to further illuminate the significance of interpersonal identification in the CA context, it is necessary to firstly recall the following points—distilled from SRV theory—about the distinction between, and the implications of, valuation and valued roles (Thomas & Wolfensberger, 1999).

As a social science theory, SRV seeks to separate the wheat of empiricism from the chaff of ideology. Therefore, SRV can only valorize the roles of

a party. It cannot address the valuation of a party, which transcends the boundaries of social science. Nonetheless, SRV recognizes that incumbency of valued roles is likely to lead to the intrinsic valuation of the role incumbent. Conversely, SRV notes that the intrinsic valuation of a party is likely to lead to incumbency of valued roles for that party. Furthermore, there is a catalytic feedback loop between valued roles and valuation. That is, valued roles can lead to, or reinforce, valuation; and valuation can lead to, or reinforce, valued roles. Lastly, SRV proposes that good things will be accorded to a party who is valued and/or is seen in valued roles. However, because people characteristically relate to each other through the medium of social roles, it is argued that valued roles are the major pathway to accessing the good things of life.

Although the above points will be familiar to those well-versed in SRV theory, reviewing them can be helpful in clarifying how the presence or absence of interpersonal identification in an advocacy match will be ramifying in terms of valuation and valued roles.

In regard to valuation, the experience of Citizen Advocacy programs attests that many advocates value, care for, and even love, their protégé. Nonetheless, SRV theory acknowledges the possibility that even a person who is valued “for him or herself” by others, may still be role-cast in devalued roles by those very others who value the person. Therefore, it is conceivable that an advocate—who believes in the inherent value of the protégé—may still perceive and treat that protégé in ways that reflect the devalued roles into which the protégé has been cast. For instance, an advocate who displays a paternalistic attitude towards the protégé has probably role-cast the person in the eternal child role. When an advocate sees the protégé through the prism of certain devalued roles, the advocate is not likely to identify with that protégé. A corollary to the lack of identification is that the advocate will encounter difficulty in discerning and pursuing the protégé’s interests, including role-valorization for the protégé.

On the other hand, when an advocate’s valuation of the protégé emanates from, and is sustained by, interpersonal identification, that advocate is apt to take actions that will benefit the protégé, including securing valued roles for the protégé. Another way to put it is that a function of advocate identification is valuation and valued roles accorded to the protégé. Hence, drilling down the narrative of a suitable match is likely to yield the discovery that its bedrock is interpersonal identification.

The Distinctive Nature of Citizen Advocacy Relationships in Engendering the Outcomes of Valuation, Valued Roles, and the Good Things of Life

HAVING EMPHASIZED THE MOTIF of advocate identification with the protégé, greater insight into the nature of Citizen Advocacy relationships can be gained by examining its outcomes of—and the interplay between—valuation, valued roles, and the good things of life, accorded to the protégé.

Beginning with the outcome of valued roles, it is demonstrable that the Citizen Advocacy scheme serves as an incubator for a multitude of valued roles for the protégé. As an entry point to the discussion on role-valorization for the protégé, two broad-brush observations can be made.

Firstly, it should be noted that a person recruited by the CA office as a protégé is usually someone who does not have many—or even any—valued roles. In all probability, the protégé’s perilous situation, which led to the CA office’s decision to find an advocate for the person, can be ascribed to a lack of valued roles in that person’s life. After all, it is the absence of valued roles, and also the presence of devalued ones, which will thrust a person into devalued status, and which is likely to necessitate advocacy on that person’s behalf. Consequently, for a person who is sweltering in an existential desert without valued roles, an oasis of positive roles is all the more important.

Secondly, it is worth emphasizing that the one-to-one nature of CA relationships is conducive to accessing valued roles. As Wolfensberger has stated, role-valorization is most productive on the personal or small-scale level (Wolfensberger, 2009).

It can be argued that there are two main paths in procuring valued roles for the protégé. Roles can be made accessible in ways that are either (a) inherent or (b) intentional. Whilst acknowledging that the terms inherent and intentional are not enshrined in the canon of Citizen Advocacy—they are not commonly found in CA discourse—the terms have been adopted as useful descriptors in the ensuing section. Furthermore, it must be conceded that the distinction between the terms is not invariably clear-cut in practice.

(a) An inherent role is one that is inherent to a protégé-advocate match, because the role is organically assumed by the two parties as a direct consequence of forming a relationship. Ideally, the inherent roles of the advocate and protégé should complement rather than clash, so that there is a good “fit.” The following are some examples of valued roles for the protégé that are inherent and complementary.

If friendship is one dimension of a match, then the valued role of friend is logically filled by the advocate, and (more importantly) the protégé. On a practical level, if one aspect of the advocate’s role is to serve as an informal teacher or mentor, then the protégé can assume the complementary role of learner, in a broad sense of the word. To be seen in the role of learner is, of course, particularly important for people who are burdened with negative assumptions about their potential to learn. Thus, the role of learner is a valued one for the protégé, because it is suffused with positive expectations about the person’s capacity to learn and acquire competencies.

Advocates, too, can find themselves in the role of learner, who experientially learn from—or through involvement with—their protégé. For instance, advocates whose protégés are clients

of the human services soon learn, among other things, that the human service emperor is either wearing no clothes, or only the withered fig leaf of rhetoric.

Significantly, an advocate may be in the role of learner, with the protégé in the role of teacher—at least in certain circumstances or contexts. One advocate said: “Michael teaches me to be more accepting of people who are different” (Quotes From Citizen Advocates, 1997). Another advocate made this point about the protégé: “He’s a better teacher than I, but I’m learning” (Tyne, 1998).

(b) In contrast to inherent roles, intentional roles are ones that the protégé acquires as a result of the premeditated actions of the advocate. An example of an intentional role is the valued role of a worker, which a protégé can secure with the advocate’s help. Another example is the role of a member of a community group. The valued role of community group member can be rendered accessible to the protégé, as a result of the advocate deliberately yet seamlessly introducing the protégé to that group, of which the advocate is already a member.

The feedback loop between valuation and valued roles (inherent or intentional—driven by the advocate’s identification with the protégé—is worth reflecting on for its potentially wide-reaching consequences for the protégé. That is, an advocate who identifies with the protégé is likely to value, and find valued roles for, the protégé. Furthermore, given the dynamics of imitation and modelling, other parties are also apt to value, and extend valued roles to, the protégé. Of particular significance is the social value attributed to certain relational roles assumed by the protégé, precisely because those roles are freely-given. Thus, a protégé who is in the valued role of friend of the advocate—a role that, by definition, must be freely-given—will be valued as a person by others. It is the characteristic of volition that gives value to the role and the role incumbent. As Wolfensberger has stated: “people are more willing to ex-

tend positive valuation and respect to a person if they see that other people have entered freely and voluntarily into a relationship with the person, and therefore must see the person as valuable” (Wolfensberger, 1995).

Yet another observation about valued roles for the protégé can be made vis-à-vis the good things of life, the highest goal of SRV (Wolfensberger, Thomas & Caruso, 1996). As illustrated in Table 2, many roles that a protégé can access in or through a CA relationship closely correspond to, or actually represent, some of those good things of life.

Table 2
EXAMPLES OF VALUED ROLES ATTAINABLE BY THE PROTÉGÉ, AND WHICH DIRECTLY CORRESPOND TO SOME OF THE GOOD THINGS OF LIFE

Valued social role of protégé	SRV-defined good things of life
Family member, via legal adoption or informal acceptance	Family, or equivalent small group Home
Friend	Friendship Being treated as an individual
Worker	Work Being able to contribute
Learner; student; growing individual	Pro-growth expectancies and opportunities
Member of the community	Access to sites and activities of everyday life

One advocate, who may not have been familiar with the SRV delineation of the good things of life, but who was presumably speaking from experience as an advocate, reflected on some goals that most of us aspire to achieve: “People with disabilities want the same things that I want: a home, real work, friends” (Quotes From Citizen Advocates, 1997). That those good things of life have been

attainable for many protégés is a testament to the power of Citizen Advocacy.

A Citizen Advocacy Match That Exemplifies the Realisation of Some Role Goals for the Protégé Party

HITHERTO, DISCUSSION HAS CENTERED ON the acquisition of valued roles by the protégé party. However, SRV posits that there is much more that can be done: not only to assist a party to gain valued roles, but also to lose devalued roles, and to desirably change existing ones. In other words, there are actions that can be taken to achieve the so-called role goals (Wolfensberger, 1998).

Accordingly, it is instructive to recount a match that I made in 1992, to elucidate how some role goals were realised for the protégé. Some background information about Bob (protégé) and Keith (advocate) is helpful in contextualising Bob’s role goals.

Bob is a man with a mild intellectual impairment. He is also susceptible to bouts of depression. Bob’s childhood had been difficult; he became estranged from his father, and did not know his mother. He has a sister. Since his teenage years, Bob has serially broken the law, and has been in and out of jail. His offences have mostly been breaking and entering and stealing.

Keith is an engineer by profession. He is married, and has two children. Keith was specifically identified as a potential advocate for Bob, and he agreed to assume that role when approached by the Citizen Advocacy office. Keith was introduced to Bob in prison, while he was serving a sentence for breaking and entering.

The relationship of Bob and Keith is an inspiring story, punctuated by many moments of magic and majesty. However, the following analysis of their match is based strictly on the role goals achieved for Bob.

Valorizing the positive roles the protégé already holds: brother

BOB IS NOW MUCH CLOSER to his sister, due to the efforts of Keith. On assuming the role of Bob’s ad-

vocate, Keith encouraged greater contact between Bob and his sister. On occasions, Keith even took Bob's sister with him when visiting Bob in prison. Largely because of Keith, Bob's role of brother grew in strength and prominence.

Retaining or regaining valued roles of the protégé: son

KEITH WAS ALSO SUCCESSFUL in re-connecting Bob with his father, from whom he had been emotionally distant for many years. Although it took several attempts, and cumulative gains with each attempt, Bob's father and he now have a much closer father-son relationship.

Exchanging the protégé's devalued roles for less devalued ones: prisoner to parolee

INCONTESTABLY, IT WAS KEITH'S CREDIBILITY and commitment that persuaded the authorities of the justice system to grant parole to Bob, some time after he was introduced to Keith. Indeed, it was the superintendent of the prison who advised the CA office that Keith's advocacy role had been favourably considered in the decision to release Bob on parole.

Extricating the protégé from devalued roles: habitual criminal

UNFORTUNATELY, DESPITE KEITH'S SUPPORT, Bob did re-offend, and consequently served several more prison sentences. Nonetheless, it is compellingly clear that Keith's unconditional support was crucial in ultimately extricating Bob from the quagmire of recidivism. Keith told the Citizen Advocacy office that he had said to Bob, without any hint of condoning Bob's actions: "Our relationship doesn't depend on whether you re-offend or not." Happily, the last time Bob committed an offence was in 2002.

Enabling the protégé to enter into new valued roles: friend; friend of the family; worker

BOB AND KEITH have become good friends, who—among other activities—go fishing regularly. Bob

is also known as a "friend of the family," a role that he clearly savours. He has a good relationship with Keith's wife and his two children.

After Keith became Bob's advocate and Bob was released from prison, it was Keith who found work for him. Keith was successful in securing employment for Bob in the large municipality in which Keith worked, but in a position that was sufficiently distant from his role as engineer, so as to minimise conflicts of interest. Subsequently and repeatedly, Keith has assisted Bob in finding other employment.

Averting the protégé from entering (additional) devalued roles: welfare recipient; disability service client

KEITH'S ADVOCACY has also been decisive in preventing Bob from getting on the juggernaut of dependency. Without the support of Keith, Bob would have entered, and become entrenched in, the all-encompassing role of career client of the welfare and disability system.

A gratifying coda is that, today, the relationship of Bob and Keith is as strong as ever—over 20 years after they were introduced to each other by the Citizen Advocacy office.

Conclusion

IN ENDEAVOURING TO SCULPT the argument that valued roles and valuation are among the outcomes of Citizen Advocacy for the protégé, a qualifying asterisk must be added. That is: to underscore that the core mission of Citizen Advocacy is neither the valuation of—nor securing valued roles for—the protégé. It can be recalled that the central mission of Citizen Advocacy is to promote and protect the interests and welfare of specific individuals at risk (Wolfensberger & Peters, 2002/2003).

Indisputably, many benefits can be derived from Citizen Advocacy. They include outcomes such as social integration, community building—and, of course, valued social roles for the protégé. It is also true that positive outcomes, such as hold-

ing valued roles, clearly contribute to the interests and welfare of the protégé, as explained in this article. Nonetheless, it must be stipulated that the attainment of valued roles, like other derivative benefits, does not—in and of itself—constitute the primary mission of Citizen Advocacy.

However, regardless of the outcomes of Citizen Advocacy, it should be evident that the potency of its work is pervasively nourished by SRV theory. It is, therefore, heartening to observe that there is something of a natural and mutually-informing alliance between people who are involved in CA and those who are involved in SRV. At the same time, it is not clear that the membrane between CA and SRV has been made permeable enough so that more people in CA are predisposed to accessing and applying SRV in the course of their work. (At least that is the author's opinion, formed and informed by his experience with Citizen Advocacy programs in Australia.)

To advance the argument that CA programs are not always sufficiently SRV-literate, and how that impacts on their work, an example concerning imagery can be readily provided. Almost invariably, at least some of the needs of any protégé will be image-related, regardless of other needs the person may also have, including more pressing ones. After all, for people with an intellectual disability, it is usually their competency impairment that leads to their image impairment, thus creating image needs for them. A CA office that is not aware of image issues is apt to violate the previously-mentioned principle, Positive Interpretations of Handicapped People. Unfortunately, instances can be cited where CA offices have expediently sacrificed the image needs of the protégés of their program on the altar of fundraising, by inviting potential contributors to view protégés through the pity-charity lens. Hence, without some familiarity with SRV, a CA office will find it difficult to fireproof its activities from causing image harm to the protégé—even if there are benefits to the protégé due to the advocate's actions.

Today, more than ever, potent advocacy on behalf of devalued people is wanted, but wanting. Of course, CA is but one form of (personal) advocacy. It cannot do everything, but it can do something. And that something may mean everything to someone. If Citizen Advocacy is to do that something that can be everything for someone, it must be guided by the compass of SRV. It is hoped that this article can make a contribution in reinforcing that axiom. ☺

REFERENCES

- Hildebrand, A. (1991, November). Like he was me. *Citizen Advocacy Forum*, 2(1), 25.
- O'Brien, J. & Wolfensberger, W. (1979). *CAPE: Standards for Citizen Advocacy Program Evaluation*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.
- Peters, M. (2007). How SRV-based image issues can inform considerations of advocate identity and recruitment in Citizen Advocacy. *The SRV Journal*, 2(2), 31-36.
- Peters, M. (2012). Role call: Citizen Advocacy relationships as a source of valued social roles for people with disabilities. *The SRV Journal*, 7(1), 17-25.
- Quotes from citizen advocates. (1997, Winter). *One to One* (Newsletter of Citizen Advocacy Perth West, Australia), 18(2), 5. (Reprinted from Citizen Advocacy Eastside Newsletter).
- Thomas, S. & Wolfensberger, W. (1999). An overview of Social Role Valorization. In Flynn, R.J. & Lemay, R. (Eds.), *A quarter-century of Normalization and Social Role Valorization: Evolution and Impact*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press, 125-159.
- Tyne, A. (1998). Advocate: Robert; Partner: Geoffrey. In Williams, P. (Ed.), *Standing by me: Stories of Citizen Advocacy*. London: Citizen Advocacy Information and Training, 5.
- Wolfensberger, W. (1972). *The principle of normalization in human services*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.
- Wolfensberger, W. (1995, January-March). A brief outline of some of the most important concepts and assumptions underlying Citizen Advocacy. *Citizen Advocacy Forum*, 5 (1), 16-22.

Wolfensberger, W. (1998). *A brief introduction to Social Role Valorization: A high-order concept for addressing the plight of societally devalued people, and for structuring human services* (3rd ed.). Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Training Institute for Human Service Planning, Leadership & Change Agency.

Wolfensberger, W. (2009). Concluding comments at the 2nd (1999) and 4th (2007) International Social Role Valorization Conferences in Boston, Massachusetts & Ottawa, Ontario. *The SRV Journal*, 4(1), 10-27.

Wolfensberger, W. & Glenn, L. (1975, reprinted 1978). *PASS (Program Analysis of Service Systems): A method for the quantitative evaluation of human services: Vol. 1. Handbook: Vol. 2. Field manual* (3rd ed.). Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Wolfensberger, W. & Peters, M. (2002, December/2003, January). An updated sketch of the rationales for the existence and independence of the Citizen Advocacy office. *Citizen Advocacy Forum*, 12(1&2), 4-23.

Wolfensberger, W. & Zauha, H. (1973). *Citizen Advocacy and protective services for the impaired and handicapped*. Toronto: National Institute on Mental Retardation.

Wolfensberger, W., Thomas, S. & Caruso, G. (1996). Some of the universal 'good things of life' which the implementation of Social Role Valorization can be expected to make more accessible to devalued people. *SRV/VRS: The International Social Role Valorization Journal/La Revue Internationale de la Valorisation des Rôles Sociaux*, 2(2), 12-14.

MITCHEL PETERS is a founding member & the former co-ordinator of Citizen Advocacy Eastern Suburbs in Perth, Australia.

THE CITATION FOR THIS ARTICLE IS

Peters, M. (2017). The importance of the Citizen Advocacy scheme in facilitating valued roles for, & the valuation of, vulnerable people. *The SRV Journal*, 11(2), 6-15.